party wishes to introduce any evidence to be considered at final hearing (§1.671). Any evidence that a party wishes to have considered with respect to the decisions and deferred motions identified for consideration or review at final hearing shall be filed or, if appropriate, noticed under §1.671(e) during the testimony period of the party. A request for a testimony period shall be construed as including a request for final hearing.

(4) If the paper contains an explanation of why judgment should not be entered in accordance with the order, and if no party has requested a final hearing, the decision that is the basis for the order shall be reviewed based on the contents of the paper and the response. If the paper fails to show good cause, the Board shall enter judgment against the party against whom the order issued.

[49 FR 48455, Dec. 12, 1984; 50 FR 23124, May 31, 1985, as amended at 60 FR 14525, Mar. 17, 1995]

§1.641 Unpatentability discovered by administrative patent judge.

(a) During the pendency of an interference, if the administrative patent judge becomes aware of a reason why a claim designated to correspond to a count may not be patentable, the administrative patent judge may enter an order notifying the parties of the reason and set a time within which each party may present its views, including any argument and any supporting evidence, and, in the case of the party whose claim may be unpatentable, any appropriate preliminary motions under §§1.633 (c), (d) and (h).

(b) If a party timely files a preliminary motion in response to the order of the administrative patent judge, any opponent may file an opposition (§1.638(a)). If an opponent files an opposition, the party may reply (§1.638(b)).

(c) After considering any timely filed views, including any timely filed preliminary motions under §1.633, oppositions and replies, the administrative patent judge shall decide how the interference shall proceed.

[60 FR 14526, Mar. 17, 1995]

§1.642 Addition of application or patent to interference.

During the pendency of an interference, if the administrative patent judge becomes aware of an application or a patent not involved in the interference which claims the same patentable invention as a count in the interference, the administrative patent judge may add the application or patent to the interference on such terms as may be fair to all parties.

[60 FR 14526, Mar. 17, 1995]

§1.643 Prosecution of interference by assignee.

(a) An assignee of record in the Patent and Trademark Office of the entire interest in an application or patent involved in an interference is entitled to conduct prosecution of the interference to the exclusion of the inventor.

(b) An assignee of a part interest in an application or patent involved in an interference may file a motion (§1.635) for entry of an order authorizing it to prosecute the interference. The motion shall show the inability or refusal of the inventor to prosecute the interference or other cause why it is in the interest of justice to permit the assignee of a part interest to prosecute the interference. The administrative patent judge may allow the assignee of a part interest to prosecute the interference upon such terms as may be appropriate.

[49 FR 48455, Dec. 12, 1984, as amended at 60 FR 14527, Mar. 17, 1995]

§1.644 Petitions in interferences.

(a) There is no appeal to the Commissioner in an interference from a decision of an administrative patent judge or the Board. The Commissioner will not consider a petition in an interference unless:

(1) The petition is from a decision of an administrative patent judge or the Board and the administrative patent judge or the Board shall be of the opinion that the decision involves a controlling question of procedure or an interpretation of a rule as to which there is a substantial ground for a difference of opinion and that an immediate decision on petition by the Commissioner